
Senate Budget and Fiscal Review—Wesley Chesbro, Chair
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 on Education



Subcommittee No. 1
Chair, Jack Scott
Member, Bob Margett
Member, Joe Simitian

Agenda
April 11, 2005
1:30pm or Upon Adjournment of Session. – Room 113

California Community Colleges (6870)

I. Overview of Governor's Budget Proposal for California Community Colleges (LAO)	
II. Capital Outlay	Page 3
III. Enrollment Growth	Page 4
IV. Partnership for Excellence Program	Page 5
V. Governor's Vocational-Technical Education Initiative	Page 6
VI. Student Fees	Page 7
VII. Impact of Governor's CalSTRS Proposal on community colleges (for public testimony)	Page 10
VIII. Unfunded community college systemwide Budget Proposals	Page 11
IX. Consent	Page 13

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals who, because of a disability, need special assistance to attend or participate in a Senate Committee hearing, or in connection with other Senate services, may request assistance at the Senate Rules Committee, 1020 N Street, Suite 255 or by calling 916-324-9335. Requests should be made one week in advance whenever possible.

I. Overview of Proposed Community Colleges Budget (Office of the Legislative Analyst)

Figure 1

Community College Budget Summary

(Dollars in Millions)

	Actual 2003-04	Estimated 2004-05	Proposed 2005-06	Change From 2004-05	
				Amount	Percent
Community College Proposition 98					
General Fund	\$2,272.5	\$3,036.3	\$3,320.9	\$284.6	9.4%
Local property tax	2,102.1	1,750.4	1,827.0	76.7	4.4
Subtotals, Proposition 98	(\$4,374.6)	(\$4,786.7)	(\$5,147.9)	(\$361.3)	(7.5%)
Other Funds					
General Fund	(\$132.4)	(\$247.7)	(\$259.9)	(\$12.2)	(4.9%)
Proposition 98 Reversion Account	0.1	5.4	20.0	14.6	271.5
State operations	8.6	8.9	8.8	-0.1	-1.2
Teachers' retirement	40.3	98.3	79.8	-18.5	-18.8
Bond payments	83.3	135.1	151.3	16.2	12.0
State lottery funds	120.8	143.3	139.9	-3.4	-2.4
Other state funds	8.6	8.8	9.1	0.3	2.9
Student fees	243.3	357.5	368.2	10.7	3.0
Federal funds	249.2	277.1	277.1	—	—
Other local funds	1,563.8	1,738.9	1,738.8	-0.1	—
Subtotals, other funds	(\$2,318.1)	(\$2,773.4)	(\$2,793.1)	(\$19.7)	(0.7%)
Grand Totals	\$6,692.7	\$7,560.1	\$7,941.0	\$380.9	5.0%

II. Community Colleges Capital Outlay.

The Governor's Budget includes \$262.5 million to fund (or partially fund) 50 projects on community college campuses across the state. These projects are proposed to be supported by the proceeds of the 2004 statewide educational facilities bond measure.

In its *Analysis of the 2005-06 Budget Bill*, the Legislative Analyst raises concerns with the Administration's methodology for funding higher education capital outlay projects as the state nears the end of the General Obligation Bond (GO) cycle. Specifically, the LAO is concerned that the state will start funding projects (in the "preliminary planning" or "working drawings" phase of the project) without sufficient cash on hand to see the projects through to completion (including the "construction" and "equipment" financing phases). As an alternative, the LAO offers a recommendation which would prioritize capital outlay projects based on their "critical" nature and then fund only those projects which meet the highest priority – projects which address critical fire, life safety, and/or seismic deficiencies. Projects of lower priority could be approved using non-state resources.

On a project-by-project basis, the LAO raises no concerns with any of the proposed community college facilities and instead focuses on the process the Legislature should employ in the absence of a guaranteed funding source.

Staff notes that in the past, the Legislature has opted to partially fund facility projects in an attempt to get projects "in the pipeline" and ensure that when bond funding materializes (either in the form of a statewide GO bond, or state-funded lease-revenue bonds), projects are ready for construction. However, staff notes that if a statewide bond measure is put before the voters – as is proposed by Assembly Bill 58 (Nunez) – but fails passage, the state would be pressured to continue funding the projects using a more costly (lease-revenue bond) financing method. Given the fiscal condition of the state, the committee may wish to consider the degree of "risk" it is willing to assume with regard to funding higher education capital outlay projects.

Further, the Department of Finance has recently compiled information which indicates that that as much as \$100 million in uncommitted GO bond funding is available for community college projects (above the amount provided in the Governor's Budget), which should serve to mitigate some of the LAO's concerns. Additional uncommitted GO bond funds are also available to the University of California and California State University.

If the committee opts to approve the community colleges capital outlay budget, as proposed, a complete listing of the projects is attached.

OUTCOME:

III. Student Enrollment Growth

Current law requires that the state provide a minimal level of funding to support student enrollment growth at the California Community Colleges. Specifically, statute calls for enrollment growth funding to be provided based on the percent change in the state adult population. For 2005-06, the change in the adult population is projected to be 1.89 percent; an increase of 1.89 percent in the enrollment levels of community colleges statewide would result in an additional 22,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES) at a cost of \$91.3 million.

The Governor's Budget provides funding (\$141.9 million) for 3.0 percent enrollment growth (approximately 34,000 FTES), an amount in excess of the statutorily-required level, but less than the 4.0 percent enrollment growth initially requested by the Community College system.

Enrollment Growth Projections:

As part of its *Analysis of the 2005-06 Budget Bill*, the Office of the Legislative Analyst (LAO) conducted its own review of enrollment growth projections and trends and determined that providing funding for enrollment growth of 3.0 percent would be excessive. Instead, the LAO is recommending that the Legislature only fund enrollment growth at the statutorily-required level of 1.89 percent, citing this as a level sufficient to meet the increased enrollment demand at the community colleges. Further, reducing the amount of funded enrollment growth pursuant to the LAO's recommendation would save \$50.6 million and free up funds for another, perhaps higher priority, purpose.

As part of its system budget request, the Community Colleges contend that pent up student demand (due to recent budget cuts which limited the number of course offerings and increased student fees) could put growth estimates at closer to 4 percent. This projection is echoed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) which conducts its own demographic projections and estimates that the colleges could easily absorb enrollment growth of up to 4.0 percent, especially as the state comes out of its recent recession.

Staff recommends that the proposed \$141.9 million in funding for enrollment growth be placed on the "checklist" pending the Governor's May Revision.

OUTCOME:

IV. Partnership For Excellence Program.

The Governor's Budget "sets aside" \$31.4 million for the Partnership for Excellence Program to restore funding for the program to the level appropriated by the Legislature in the 2004-05 Budget Bill. In his signing message of the 2004 Budget Act, the Governor stated that he was vetoing \$31.4 million from the total amount appropriated because the Legislature's version of the Budget Bill did not include district-level accountability measures as proposed by the Administration, and instead opted for outcomes assessed at the systemwide level.

In the same signing message, the Governor further committed to restore the \$31.4 million as part of his 2005-06 budget proposal, provided that district-by-district level accountability is incorporated into the program. In the interim, the community colleges – through their consultation process – have been working on an accountability plan to meet the intent of the Governor's message. The plan should be imminently released, at which time the Department of Finance, Legislature, Office of the Legislative Analyst, and others will begin reviewing the proposal.

The Department of Finance anticipates that they will have a proposal (including the actual appropriation of the \$31.4 million) as part of the May Revision.

Background. The Legislature and the Governor established the community colleges Partnership for Excellence Program (Chapter 330, Statutes of 1998) to provide the community college system with additional funding in exchange for increased college performance, as measured by various indicators. For the first several years, the additional funding provided for the Partnership for Excellence Program (PFE) was distributed to campuses on a simple per-student distribution while the community college system struggled to establish a funding mechanism that was contingent upon district/college performance (as called for in the statute). The struggle ended when the Community Colleges Board of Governor's abandoned its pursuit of developing a performance-contingent funding mechanism for the PFE dollars.

Historically, the original rationale behind the PFE program is somewhat murky. Some say the statute was initially designed to be a comprehensive accountability framework for community colleges while others contend that the PFE program was simply a mechanism to distribute additional resources quickly and efficiently to the community colleges, but did so under the auspices of increased accountability and performance. According to the LAO, the system made some modest gains under the PFE program, which seem to have been offset by declines as the program expired (December 2004).

Last year, as part of the budget process, the Legislature and the Administration "rolled" the PFE funding (approximately \$225 million) into the base apportionments budget of community college districts, where the funds remain despite the expiration of the program.

OUTCOME:

V. Vocational and Technical Career Initiative.

The Governor's Budget provides the California Community Colleges with a \$20 million one-time augmentation (Proposition 98 Reversion Account) to increase coordination between community colleges and high schools to fully articulate "industry-driven" career technical curricula. At the time of its release, the Governor's Budget failed to provide detail on the use of these funds, but cited the overall policy goals of (1) reducing high school dropout rates; (2) creating better alternatives for students than attending college; and (3) creating career alternatives with good pay. The Chancellor's Office, in consultation with the Department of Finance and others, recently issued a "concept paper" outlining their proposal for the expenditure of these funds.

Specifically, the Community Colleges propose to target \$14 million for "quick start" projects which will focus on "2+2 curricula". These articulated curricula provide a clear career pathway linking high school courses with community colleges courses thereby allowing students to obtain the direct skills necessary to enter into high need, emerging sectors while avoiding course duplication and unnecessary redundancy. Targeted employment sectors include: Advanced Transportation Technologies; Applied Manufacturing; Biotechnology; Environmental Technology; Geographic Information Systems; Health; Multimedia and Entertainment.

The remaining \$6 million is proposed for "Capacity Building" projects and is set aside for education providers where the 2+2 curricula are not readily available. These funds will be targeted at economically distressed areas and emerging industries. All funds are proposed be dispersed to local consortia via a Request for Proposals (RFP) process.

Trailer Bill Language. The Governor further proposed *Trailer Bill Language* which would waive the 75/25 statutory requirement -- which requires colleges to insure that at least 75 percent of their hours of instruction are taught by full-time faculty -- for vocational and technical education courses.

At the time of its *Analysis of the 2005-06 Budget Bill*, the Legislative Analyst did not have complete information to analyze this proposal, but notes that the Governor's goals of improving vocational and technical career education are both noble and necessary. While the LAO has not yet developed a formal response to the recently issued "concept paper", they have expressed concern that this proposal may fail to address the longer-term core issue of course articulation between K-12 schools and community colleges.

Staff recommends that the committee hold this issue open (including the associated trailer bill language) pending the May Revision. Further, staff recommends that the committee direct the Legislative Analyst to convene the community colleges, the Department of Finance, and the appropriate K-12 parties to further examine the proposal in light of the committee's desire to make a longer-term impact on the articulation of courses between K-12 and community colleges, and report back to the committee as part of the May Revision.

VI. Student Fees.

The Governor's Budget proposes to hold student fees at the community college constant at the current level of \$26 per unit. Unlike the University of California and California State University where the governing boards of those systems have authority to set fee levels, community college student fees are set in statute and require legislation to change.

Background.

For many years, fees at the community colleges were stable, hovering at between \$11 and \$13 per unit. In the Governor's 2003-04 Budget, the Administration proposed increasing fees to \$24 per unit; this proposal was deemed extreme by the Legislature, which increased fees \$7 per unit – for a total of \$18 per unit. The primary reason that the Legislature approved the increase to \$18 per unit was, at that level, financially-needy students would receive a "bump" in federal financial aid, thereby directly offsetting the cost for needy students. For the 2004-05 Budget, the Governor proposed, and the Legislature approved, increasing student fees from \$18 to \$26 per unit. The Governor's 2004-05 budget proposal also included the assessment of a \$50 per unit "differential" fee which would have been imposed on students with an earned baccalaureate degree; that fee proposal was rejected by the Legislature.

Legislative Analyst Recommendation.

As part of its *Analysis of the 2005-06 Budget Bill*, the Legislative Analyst recommends raising the per unit fee to \$33. Specifically, the LAO cites several direct financial aid and federal tax credit programs as the means by which the fee increase would be mitigated for low- and middle-class students and families, thus increasing General Fund revenue (by approximately \$100 million) while holding needy students harmless.

At the local level, the Board of Governors (BOG) Fee Waiver Program waives student fees for financially needy students. For middle-income students and families, the federal government provides two tax credit programs: (1) The Hope Tax Credit and (2) the Lifetime Learning Tax Credit which seek to "reimburse", via a student's tax return, various costs associated with college. According to the LAO, California is one of the few states that does not have a fee policy which takes full advantage of these federal tax benefits (which are outlined in the chart on the next page).

Figure 8
Federal Tax Benefits
Applied Toward Higher Education Fees

Hope Credit	Lifetime Learning Credit	Tuition and Fee Deduction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly reduces tax bill. • Covers 100 percent of first \$1,000 in fee payments. Covers 50 percent of second \$1,000 (for maximum tax credit of \$1,500). • Designed for middle-income students who are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> —In first or second year of college. —Attend at least half time. • Phases out entirely at adjusted income of \$52,000 for single filers and \$105,000 for married filers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly reduces tax bill. • Covers 20 percent of first \$10,000 in fee payments. • Designed for any middle-income student beyond first two years of college. • Phases out entirely at adjusted income of \$52,000 for single filers and \$105,000 for married filers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces taxable income. • Deducts up to \$2,000 in fee payments. • Designed for any upper middle-income student not qualifying for a tax credit. • Capped at adjusted income of \$65,000 for single filers and \$160,000 for married filers.

Staff notes that the LAO is essentially proposing a "high student fee – high student aid" model for the community colleges, and suggests that the committee examine the pros and cons associated with such a model.

For example, high student fees have tended to result in "sticker shock" among various demographic groups, creating a barrier to higher education. In particular, students from lower socio-economic groups, first generation college students, and students with limited English proficiency, tend to be more deterred by the fee costs posted in college catalogs and are less able to navigate the administrative hurdles associated with either applying for financial aid or reaping the monetary benefits associated with federal tax credits/deductions. In addition, many students could have a "cash flow" problem whereby they pay fees at the beginning of each semester, but don't receive any money back from the various tax benefits until after they file their returns in February or March (at the earliest).

Unlike prior years, community college fees are now at a level where California students receive the full, maximum amount of the federal Pell Grant (as opposed to a lesser grant amount under the Pell Grant Tuition Sensitivity clause, whereby, for many years, federal law did not allow California's community college students to receive the full grant amount if a college's fees were below \$26 per unit). Fees reached this level at the urging of the Legislative Analyst, which cited a loss in federal funds as a reason to increase student fees. The LAO continues along the same path by trying to maximize federal tax credits and deductions with fee increases.

As part of its recommendation, the Legislative Analyst, along with the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), recommends that the Legislature enact, via legislation, a long-term statutory student fee policy, in order to determine how fees should be adjusted annually. Staff notes that such legislation would be more appropriate to the policy committee process, rather than Budget,

process. However, In the absence of such a policy, CPEC calls for community college fees to be held constant (pursuant to the Governor's proposal).

Staff recommends that the committee hold this issue open, pending the May Revision.

OUTCOME:

VII. Impact of CalSTRS Reform Proposal

This issue was previously heard by the committee on March 7, 2005. The Governor's proposal was presented by the Department of Finance with responses from the Office of the Legislative Analyst and representatives from the California State Teachers Retirement System (CalSTRS).

In order to avoid replicating the March 7th hearing, the purpose of this item today is to provide an opportunity for representatives from the various community college constituencies to testify on the impact of this proposal to local college districts and individuals.

No action necessary by this committee. This item will be heard by Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee #4 on April 20, 2005.

OUTCOME:

VIII. Unfunded Community College Budget Proposals.

The Community Colleges Board of Governors requested additional funding, totaling over \$260 million, for a variety of uses that were not approved by the Administration or included in the Governor's Budget. Following is a listing of the several items which were denied funding.

1. Equalization (\$80 million).

The Governor's Budget fails to provide additional funding to equalize the per student funding rate, which varies widely across the state. In 2004-05, the Governor provided, and the Legislature approved, an \$80 million augmentation as a first step toward equalizing the per student funding rates and adopted legislation specifying how the funds were to be allocated. The Chancellor's Office estimates that at a cost of an additional \$80 million per year (including the funds provided in the current year), it would take two more years to reach the state's goal of having at least 90 percent of the students in the system receiving the same dollar amount per FTES.

In its *Analysis of the 2005-06 Budget Bill*, the Legislative Analyst recommends that the Legislature consider allocating additional Proposition 98 funding for equalization and that funds be allocated in a manner consistent with current law (Chapter 216, Statutes of 2004). The LAO further notes that while it is supportive of such budget increases as enrollment growth and Cost of Living Adjustments, the next highest priority for the Legislature should be to fund a second installment of \$80 million for equalization.

Staff recommends that \$80 million for Equalization be place on the "checklist" pending the May Revision.

OUTCOME:

2. CalPASS (\$500,000 ongoing Prop. 98).

The California Partnership for Achieving Student Success (CalPASS) is a data sharing system among all segments of education, with the purpose of improving student's transition between high schools, community colleges, and universities. According to the LAO, these data are used by faculty consortia, institutions, and researchers to identify barriers to student transfer, monitor student progress, and propose solutions to better facilitate the movement of students. Participation in CalPASS is voluntary and was initially designed as a regional pilot program limited to schools and colleges in the San Diego region. To date, CalPASS has expanded statewide and includes more than 700 California educational institutions.

The LAO recommends that this program be extended (funding for CalPASS is scheduled to expire at the end of 2005-06) and augmented, so that the program retains a base level of funding in the amount of \$1.5 million. Of this amount, \$500,000 will come from the existing funding; the LAO proposes that the remaining \$1 million be redirected from the community college Partnership for Excellence Program.

Staff recommends that \$1 million be placed on the "checklist" pending the May Revision.

OUTCOME:

3. Non-Credit Instruction (\$30 million).

Non-credit instruction (also known as Adult Education within the K-12 system) includes such courses as Basic Skills; English as a Second Language (ESL); Citizenship; Parenting; short-term vocational education programs; and educational programs for older adults and persons with substantial disabilities. The current "rate" per non-credit full-time equivalent student (FTES) is \$2,125, about 60 percent of the *credit* FTES rate (approximately \$3,500). The Community Colleges Chancellor's Office notes that non-credit instruction tends to act as a "gateway" for both recent immigrants and long-term residents into higher education and/or the workforce.

The \$30 million augmentation request was designed by the Chancellor's Office to be the first step in a multi-year process to increase the rate of non-credit FTES to approximately 70 percent of credit FTES rate. \$30 million in 2005-06 would increase the existing rate by about \$300 per FTES.

Staff notes that various community college constituencies are currently working on a revised funding formula for the community college system in order to replace the antiquated Program-Based Funding Model. It is possible that this new funding formula may be a better avenue to address the inequitable funding rates associated with non-credit instruction. The proposal will be carried in Senate Bill 361, authored by Senator Scott.

4. Professional Development (\$2.5 million ongoing; \$2.5 million one-time).

The Governor's Budget provides no funding for Professional Development. The program was eliminated in 2002-03 as part of the various budget reductions to the community colleges. Prior to its elimination, this program was funded annually at \$5.2 million.

5. Restore Support for Matriculation Services (\$23.3 million).

Community colleges requested that the state provide funding for matriculation services equivalent to the amount spent in 2001-02. At that point in time, the state spent what amounts to \$72 per FTES (\$72.3 million total). As adjusted for enrollment growth, the community colleges requested an augmentation of approximately \$30 million, over a two year period, to provide \$72 per student beginning in 2005-06. Specifically, they are requesting an augmentation of \$23.3 million in 2005-06 and the remaining \$6.7 million in 2006-07.

Background. *Matriculation* includes a variety of services offered to students beginning when they first arrive on campus and continuing until they leave or graduate. Specifically, these activities include orientation, assessment, placement, and counseling. According to the Chancellor's Office, the availability and use of these services may spell the difference between educational success and a wasted educational experience to an inconclusive end.

Funding for this program has varied in recent years, with a low of \$54.3 million (for both the 2002-03 and 2003-04 fiscal years) and a high of \$72.3 million in 2001-02. In his 2005-06 Budget Proposal, the Governor includes \$66.2 million for matriculation.

IX. Proposed Consent

No issues have been raised with the following items, and staff recommends that they be Approved as Budgeted.

6870-001-0001. Support, California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office \$8,814,000

6870-001-0574. Support, California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office. Payable from the 1998 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund \$1,434,000

6870-001-0909. Support, California Community Colleges. Fund for Instructional Improvement \$19,000

6870-001-0925. Support, California Community Colleges. California Business Resource and Assistance Innovation Network Fund \$15,000

6870-101-0001. Add Provision 17.5 of Item 6870-101-0001 California Community Colleges, related to part-time faculty compensation, *per April 2005 Finance Letter*.

6870-101-0001. Revise Provision 13 of Item 6870-101-0001 California Community Colleges, related to remedial education services at state developmental centers, *per April 2005 Finance Letter*.

6870-101-0001. Revise Provision 16 of Item 6870-101-0001 California Community Colleges, related to Foster Care Education, *per April 2005 Finance Letter*.

Foster Parent Care Education Program. Proposed statutory (Trailer Bill) changes to Section 1529.2 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 903.7 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

6870-101-0909. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. Fund for Instructional Improvement \$302,000

6870-101-0925. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. California Business Resources and Assistance Innovation Network Fund \$15,000

6870-102-0959. Transfer from Foster Parent Training Fund to General Fund (\$3,000,000)

6870-103-0001. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. Lease Revenue Bond Payments \$1,512,000

6870-111-0001. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges. CalWORKS Services, Foster Parent Training, Vocational Education \$0

6870-295-0001. Local Assistance, California Community Colleges Local Mandates \$4,000

6870-301-6028. Add Item, California Community Colleges, *per April 2005 Finance Letter*. \$2,374,000 from Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond of 2002, for Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles Trade Technical College: Building F Structural Repair.

6870-601-6041. Reduce Item, California Community Colleges, *per April 2005 Finance Letter*, by \$28,142,000. Of this amount, \$7,823,000 is from a delay in the Health /Physical Science Building Renovation project at Chaffey College and \$20,319,000 is due to the need to redesign the High Technology Center at Santa Barbara City College.

6870-496. Reversion, California Community Colleges.

District	College	Project Name	BOG Category	Phase	2005-06 Amount
BUDGET ITEM-Item 6870-301-6041					
Barstow CCD	Barstow College	Student Services Modernization	C	PWC	1,520,000
Butte-Glenn CCD	Butte College	Library Renovation and Expansion	B	PWCE	8,402,000
Chaffey CCD	Chaffey College	Health and Physical Science Renovation	C	CE	7,823,000
Citrus CCD	Citrus College	Vocational Technology Building	C	PW	866,000
Desert CCD	College of the Desert	Walter and Sewer Infrastructure Replacement	A-4	PW	232,000
Contra Costa CCD	Los Medanos College	Core Building Remodel	C	PW	182,000
El Camino CCD	El Camino College	Learning Resource Center Addition	B	CE	8,151,000
Foothill-De Anza CCD	DeAnza College	Performing Arts Center	D	PWCE	4,428,000
Hartnell CCD	Hartnell East Campus	Ctr for Assessmt & Lifelong Learning	B	CE	10,303,000
Kern CCD	Porterville College	Science Modernization	C	PWC	2,605,000
Long Beach CCD	LB City College PCC	Library/Learning Resource Center	B	CE	5,757,000
Long Beach CCD	LB City College LAC	Library/LRC Renovation/Expansion	B	CE	13,715,000
Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles City College	LRC (Health Safety)	A-2	E	1,298,000
Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Harbor College	Adaptive PE & PE Building Renovation	D	CE	6,280,000
Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Harbor College	Child Development Center	D	PWCE	3,296,000
Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Mission College	Health & Physical Education Building	D	PWCE	13,259,000
Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Pierce College	Physical Sciences Renovation	C	PWCE	3,785,000
Los Rios CCD	Consumnes River College	Police, Print and Office Building Modernization	F	PWC	1,991,000
Los Rios CCD	Sacramento City College	North Gym Building Modernization	C	PWC	3,004,000
Los Rios CCD	Folsom Lake College	Fine Arts Instructional Building	B	PWC	11,434,000
Merced CCD	Merced College	Leshner Building Remodel	F	PWCE	2,627,000
Mira Costa College	40.31.109	Horticulture Complex	D	CE	5,838,000
Monterey Peninsula CCD	Monterey Peninsula College	Child Development Center	D	CE	4,117,000
Monterey Peninsula CCD	Monterey Peninsula College	Library Building Renovation/Conversion	F	PWCE	2,715,000
Mt. San Jacinto CCD	Meniffee Valley Center	Technology Center	B	CE	10,775,000
Palo Verde CCD	Palo Verde College	Fine and Performing Arts	D	PW	1,071,000
Rancho Santiago CCD	Santiago Canyon College	Learning Resource Center (Books)	A-2	E	709,000
Rancho Santiago CCD	Santiago Canyon College	Science Building	A-2	E	867,000

District	College	Project Name	BOG Category	Phase	2005-06 Amount
Rio Hondo CCD	Rio Hondo College	Applied Technology Build Reconstruction	C	PW	828,000
Rio Hondo CCD	Rio Hondo College	Learning Resource/High Tech. Center	B	CE	28,211,000
San Francisco CCD	Phelan Campus	Jt. Use Instructional Facility	B	W	1,036,000
San Francisco CCD	John Adams Center	John Adams Modernization	C	C	23,176,000
San Luis Obispo Co. CCD	Cuesta College	Reconstruct and Add Laboratories	C	CE	6,812,000
San Luis Obispo Co. CCD	North County Center	Technology & Trades Complex	B	CE	7,816,000
San Mateo Co. CCD	Canada College	Library/LRC/Student Services Center	A-2	E	3,360,000
San Mateo Co. CCD	College of San Mateo	Student Services Consolidation	A-2	E	263,000
San Mateo Co. CCD	Skyline College	Allied Health Vocational Training Center	C	PW	276,000
Santa Barbara CCD	Santa Barbara City College	High Technology Center	B	CE	20,319,000
Santa Barbara CCD	Santa Barbara City College	Drama Music Building Modernization	C	PW	786,000
Santa Clarita CCD	College of the Canyons	Physical Education Addition	D	PWCE	2,954,000
Sierra Jt. CCD	Sierra College	Construct New Classroom/Labs	A-2	E	2,564,000
Sonoma Co. CCD	Santa Rosa Jr. College	Plover Library Conversion	F	C	3,050,000
State Center CCD	Fresno City College	Student Services Bldg Remodel	F	C	3,514,000
State Center CCD	Willow International Center	Academic Facilities & Site Development Phase I	A-2	E	3,920,000
Ventura Co. CCD	Oxnard College	Warehouse	A-4	CE	1,822,000
Ventura Co. CCD	Ventura College	Building APP, S and DP Modernization	C	PWCE	4,075,000
Ventura Co. CCD	Ventura College	Communication Building Modernization	C	CE	1,375,000
Victor Valley CCD	Victor Valley College	Seismic Replacement, Auxiliary Gym	A-3	CE	3,326,000
West Kern CCD	Taft College	Science Modernization	C	PWCE	2,741,000
Yuba CCD	Yuba College	Liberal Arts Modernization	C	PWC	3,202,000
					<u>262,476,000</u>